

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,694	HILLIS, WILLIAM DANIEL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frank W. Lu	1634	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Frank W. Lu.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Ms. Karen Canann (Reg. No. 42,382).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 March 2005
**Time:** 2 pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

 If Yes, provide a brief description: *Applicant agrees with the examiner's amendments.*
**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*Ms. Canann agrees with the examiner's amendments.*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/821,694	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HILLIS, WILLIAM DANIEL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Frank W Lu	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Frank W Lu. (3) Ms. Karen Canann (Reg. No. 42,382).  
 (2) Gary Jones. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 February 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6-24, 27-31, 33-39, and 116-118.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Ms. Canann indicates that she will submit an amendment to bring claim 116 into claim 1. The support for claims 1 and 116 comes from pages 6, 18, 23-25, and 31-33 of the specification. Since page 32, first paragraph of the specification teaches to incorporate dP or 8-oxo-dG into nucleic acid probes, both Examiners Jones and Lu agree that the only logical position to incorporate degenerate nucleotides is the variable position and therefore is not new matter. Ms. Canann will file the proposed amendment with supporting arguments which appears to place the application into condition for allowance.